

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, if any Member wants to come over for morning business, I now ask unanimous consent we have a period for morning business from now until 3:30.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INHOFE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOLE. I think by 3:30 we will be in a position to make an announcement. If we can come together on an agreement it seems very likely that we can finish this bill fairly quickly.

If not, we would have a cloture vote, and even under a cloture vote if cloture were obtained it is my understanding that 91 amendments would qualify if cloture were invoked, which is not too exciting from my point of view. It would take a while to dispose of 91 amendments.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEDICAL EMERGENCY IN THE DIRKSEN SENATE OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues in the Senate to a very dramatic episode that just occurred within the past hour and a half in the Dirksen Building.

Just outside my office, a gentleman, a guest—not of mine but a guest to the building—had a heart attack, collapsed on the floor, and while falling severely cut his head. And the young women in our office rushed out. One of them, a member of my office, is a Girl Scout leader, and knows CPR. Loosening the gentleman's necktie, she started CPR, and the other member of my staff—my personal secretary, Donna Davis—had the forethought to run down the corridor and get Senator FRIST, Dr. FRIST.

Dr. FRIST responded immediately—immediately—and went to work on this gentleman, who oddly enough was from Tennessee.

(Laughter in the Galleries)

Dr. FRIST did not check in advance.

I discussed this with members of my office, all of whom were out there watching trying to be helpful. They were unanimous in their praise and admiration for the manner in which Dr. FRIST responded, and he really knew what he was doing. He took complete charge, applied CPR, and this gentleman who was out—I mean his heart truly had stopped—to the best of their knowledge was revived because Dr. FRIST, Senator FRIST, responded so quickly. Then the emergency people came, and he was taken over to the hospital where hopefully he will survive.

But this was a very, very dramatic occurrence. And I think all of us should have great admiration, respect, and affection for what Dr. FRIST did. I am sorry that he is not here to hear these remarks. But we are very, very fortunate to have him in the U.S. Senate—not as the Senate's physician, which I am sure we would be glad to have—but there is somebody who really knows his business, and responded in a tremendous fashion. So I want to praise our colleague, Dr. FRIST.

I want to praise everybody in my office who called and responded, and Patty Parmer and the Girl Scouts. She is a Girl Scout leader. I have always been a fan of the Girl Scouts. And this gives me added respect for that organization because she is a leader. They learn CPR, and it undoubtedly contributed to saving this gentleman's life.

So there we are, Mr. President. Sometimes we get deeply involved with \$1 billion here, \$1 billion there, and what we are going to do about child care and about maintenance of effort. But there are other things that are very, very important around here. And certainly Dr. FRIST, Senator FRIST, proved his mettle this afternoon.

I want to thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BUDGET RECONCILIATION AND STUDENT AID

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, very soon the Senate Labor Committee will convene to consider how to meet the reconciliation instructions contained in the budget resolution approved earlier this year. It will mark the seventh set of reconciliation instructions sent to the Labor Committee since 1981.

The major entitlement program within the jurisdiction of the Labor Committee is the Stafford Student Loan Program. As a result, it has been the primary target in each and every reconciliation. Over the course of the past 14 years, in reconciliation and related deficit control measures, we have made almost 50 major changes in the loan program. Some are prudent and defensible; others were not.

While I have played an active role in meeting each of these instructions, I have done so with deep reservations. The primary motive in reconciliation is to save money. Unfortunately, determining whether or not the change has merit and constitutes good public policy has all too often been lost.

As I have indicated, some of the changes we have made under the pressures of reconciliation have been good; some have not. In 1981, for example, we

imposed a 5-percent origination fee on all loans. Thus, a student who applied for a \$2,000 loan would get only \$1,900 but would have to repay the loan as if he or she had received the full \$2,000. This was intended to be a temporary measure to save money; it became permanent and deserving students were the losers.

In 1987, we required State guarantee agencies to return to the Federal Government some \$250 million in so-called excess reserves. The provision did not produce the expected savings, and it had the very adverse effect of endangering the stability and the very existence of many agencies. It proved to be an unwise and unfortunate move.

In 1993, in a dramatic departure from the previous reconciliation efforts, we took action that actually helped students. In particular, the competition between the new direct student loan program and the Stafford Loan Program already in place had given students improved services, better rates, lower fees and greater benefits. It would, in my judgment, be a shame to disturb that balance.

Earlier this year, we considered the budget resolution that would have required almost \$14 billion in student loan cuts over the next 7 years. We brought that down to \$4.4 billion, with the passage of the Snowe-Simon amendment, which I supported. On final passage, however, I voted against the resolution. I did so because one of my concerns was that it would produce dramatic reductions in a series of very important Federal programs, not the least of which was the loan program.

When the budget resolution came back to the Senate after conference with the House, most of the gains we made with respect to the Stafford Loan Program were lost. We were confronted with having to come up with more than \$10 billion in savings in the loan program. As a result, I know that I for one voted against the conference report. I did so because I believed its passage meant we would make a series of unwise and unreasonable cuts in the loan program.

Over the past six reconciliations, everyone has been hit. Lenders, guarantors, secondary markets, and students—particularly students—have felt the budgetary knife. No one has been immune. All have sacrificed.

And soon, the loan program will go back to the operating table once again to require cuts so large that everyone will be subject to the knife.

I have already gone on record opposing any cuts that will affect students. In particular, I oppose any change in the in-school interest subsidy and any change that might be passed on to students. Students are already hard pressed to make ends meet as they pay for a college education. We should not make that situation worse, either while they are in school or as they repay their loans after graduation.

At the same time, I am also concerned that additional cuts among

lenders, guarantors, secondary markets, and other program participants could threaten the very stability and the very viability of the entire loan program. Adverse changes could well threaten student access to the loans they need and must have.

Further, I believe we should keep the agreement we reached in conference 2 years ago with respect to the direct student loan program. More than anything else, that agreement has worked to the benefit of students, and it is aid to students that should be our main concern.

Mr. President, I wish to make it as clear as I can that enough is enough. It is time we left the loan program alone. It is time we considered changes solely on their merits and not because they appear to save sufficient money to meet our meticulous reconciliation instructions. It is time we understood, once and for all, that the best way to reduce the deficit which hangs over us is through a strong economy supported by a well educated and well trained work force.

I favor bringing the deficit down. We all do. But I do not favor doing that on the backs of those who need our help the most—the elderly, the poor, the middle-income wage earner, and I think, most importantly, the students upon whom we must all eventually depend to keep our Nation strong and vibrant. In particular, I do not favor making cuts in the loan program or other valuable programs just to pay for a tax cut.

To my mind, the time has come for us to say no to the instructions given the Labor Committee. It is time to say no to cuts in the student loan program. It is time we took students out of harm's way.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be extended until 4 p.m., under the same provisions of the previous unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPEATING A MISBEGOTTEN AND SHAMEFUL ERA

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, as we contemplate the compromise by which we can agree to end the entitlement under the Social Security Act, title IV-A for States to receive a share of the costs for providing for dependent children, I would like to share simply for the RECORD a portion of a letter from Irwin Garfinkel, Alfred Kahn, and Sheila Kamerman of the Columbia University School of Social Work who are so concerned with what we may be doing here, and they write:

As we are sure you know, a similar madness pervaded the nation at the close of the 19th century. Then, of course, relief policy was—aside from Civil War veterans and their survivors—strictly a state, and in practice, mostly a local responsibility. As a consequence of the severe cutback in relief—

And here I interpolate that the Charity Organization Society managed to get hold of the effective control of local private agencies in many parts of the country.

as a consequence of the severe cutback in relief, we began sending large numbers of children of single mothers to orphanages. The children were referred to as half-orphans. In reaction, 40 states established mothers' pensions, the forerunner of ADC. Though we take some comfort from the reaction, our hope—that 100 years later the Nation might be spared another such misbegotten and shameful era before regaining its senses—grow dim.

I will just repeat that:

... our hope—that 100 years later the Nation might be spared another such misbegotten and shameful era before regaining its senses—grow dim.

I will say, Mr. President, that what happened in 1935 was that the State mothers' pensions were increasingly difficult for the State governments to maintain, and so they were taken over under the title IV-A, Aid to Dependent Children, which was just children at that time.

In 1939, the mother was entitled to a benefit, and it became aid to families with dependent children, the program we are evidently intent upon abolishing and repeating "a misbegotten and shameful era."

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FAIRCLOTH). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

A MISSED OPPORTUNITY

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I think earlier today we missed an opportunity. It seemingly went by unnoticed

when an amendment was offered that addressed a very sensitive area and an essential element of welfare reform, and that is a recognition that it has become a snowballing effect that a family that has welfare problems, or is on the welfare rolls, quite often the next generation comes down and is also afflicted with this same problem.

This was in the amendment offered by Senator FAIRCLOTH, No. 2609. I regret that it only received 17 votes on the floor of the Senate, and yet, I do recognize it is a very sensitive issue to deal with.

We have become and found ourselves in a situation in this country where it is a welfare trap and snares not only current recipients, but their children as well. Young women who grow up in welfare families are more than twice as likely to receive welfare themselves as their counterparts whose parents received no welfare.

I have three very short cases I will identify. These happen to come from the State of Oklahoma. They will only be identified by the individual's first names.

There is Marie, a 43-year-old, has nine kids by five different fathers. The mother was on welfare for 30 years. Marie's own daughters are unwed teen mothers on welfare.

Denise, 29 years old, had her first child at 16. She now has an additional four daughters, all born under the welfare system. Both her sisters are unwed welfare mothers with eight children.

Jacqueline, 37 years old, a mother at 15. She was born to a welfare family of 12 children. Her unwed daughter had four illegitimate children by the time she was 20.

Out-of-wedlock births and single parenthood are quickly becoming a normal lifestyle in this country. I am not sure that the Faircloth amendment was worded quite properly, but at least it did address a very serious problem that we are going to have to, sooner or later, address in this body.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INHOFE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ABANDONING A COMMITMENT

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, early today—well, at 10 o'clock this morning—we were to have commenced a series of votes that had been agreed on yesterday. There was, necessarily, a delay as Members on the other side were at a meeting with their House counterparts on, I believe, Medicare. We had a half an hour in which to talk about whatever came to mind.

I took the occasion to read a passage from the first page of the New York